

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, since that amendment was rejected, I'm back to the original form of the amendment which would require a vote by the people of the county to determine whether or not these business and agricultural exemptions would continue to be allowed. If my amendment is adopted, agricultural and business inventory will be back on the tax rolls. Senator Wehrbein has given what I even have to acknowledge are very good arguments against this being done, but I think anybody who faces the prospect of having taxes to pay could give a very good argument as to why that should not be done. Before these types of inventory were exempted taxes were being paid on them. What constitutes agricultural inventory was in the state. What constituted what is now called business inventory was in the state and the wise and lucky business persons, whether agricultural or business, were making money. There were some who were trying to make it in business who did not and probably never could, some in business likewise. But nevertheless, these two types of inventory were being taxed and I have an amendment which makes it possible for each county to determine whether they will be taxed again. So if you adopt this amendment, you will give the counties additional sources of revenue. The more money they raise, the less money the state has to give them, theoretically. Next year when we have to raise taxes we cannot look at business inventory or agricultural inventory, but the counties can. Senator Wehrbein, this probably would be impossible and I wouldn't even try to do it, but had those exemptions for business and agricultural inventory been stricken and the counties collected this money, it would have been good if it all could have gone to a central depository in a manner of speaking, then distributed among the counties and then the state give aid as it has done, but it would be less that would have to be given because the counties would have raised some of the money themselves. If that were possible it could even put the money that was taken as a result of taxing those inventories, wouldn't that be true?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I'm not sure, I really am not because I understand there is a constitutional problem about distribution of money and I really don't know. Maybe someone here is more knowledgeable about that than I, but I don't know whether you could take it on one basis and distribute it back on another or...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I wouldn't try it, but I'm saying if, and to